

Intersectionality and the study of lived citizenship: a case study on migrant women's experiences in Andalusia

Daniela Cherubini

Two critical perspectives have arisen in the contemporary debate on citizenship. The first applies feminist and intersectional theory to the study of citizenship; the second focuses on the relationship between citizenship and everyday life, therefore developing a micro-sociological perspective on 'lived citizenship' (Lister et al. 2003; Lister 2005). Drawing on a theoretical framework which encompasses these two innovative directions in citizenship studies, the paper presents the main results of ethnographic research on migrant women's everyday lived experiences of citizenship in the Spanish region of Andalusia. The analysis focuses on the experiences of these subjects in relation to intimate and family life, thus providing an example of an analysis of what has been called 'intimate citizenship' (Plummer 2003). The research, carried out between 2007 and 2010, involved 40 activists from 27 migrant women's groups based in Andalusia, from both Third Countries and EU-27 Countries.

Keywords: Intersectional theory; Lived citizenship; Migrant women; Ethnography; Citizenship studies; Feminist research

Introduction

The objective of this paper is to discuss two innovative research directions that have developed in the field of gender and feminist studies that help to analyze the transformations of citizenship in contemporary societies, especially in contexts of international immigration.

The first direction applies the concept of intersectionality to the study of citizenship (Choo and Ferree 2010; Collins 1990; Crenshaw 1991; McCall 2005; Nash 2008; Walby 2007). It therefore conceives

of citizenship as a gendered, racialised and classed construction, grounded on a system of stratified rights and opportunities which differentiates subjects according to their ethnicity and racialisation, gender and class position. The second is the micro-sociological perspective of 'lived citizenship' (Lister 2005; Lister et al. 2003; Lister et al. 2007), which focuses on the relationship between citizenship and everyday life, and deals with the different ways in which social actors give meaning to and practice the three key ele-

ments of citizenship (namely: rights, belonging and participation).

In the first part of the paper, these two lines of research are presented and placed in the broader context of the contemporary citizenship debate. In the second part, the paper provides an example of an empirical application, drawn from research on migrant women's experiences of citizenship, carried out as part of my PhD studies between 2007 and 2010. The example developed in this paper explores the experiences of migrants in relation to family relationships and intimacy. It shows how the granting or denial of rights, linked to the different immigration statuses of these women, lead to unequal opportunities in terms of self-determination in the field of intimacy.

New trends in citizenship studies

Since the end of the 1980s a wide debate on transformations in citizenship in contemporary societies has unfolded in the field of social and political science (Isin and Turner 2007; Kymlicka and Norman 1994). Over the last three decades, the concept of citizenship has changed, passing through a process of 'semantic expansion' (Costa 1999, VII). The contemporary debate, therefore, conceives of citizenship as a condition linked to legal status, but which also encompasses other social and cultural dimensions. It involves a set of rights and duties, but also a set of social practices through which peo-

ple express their ties with the social and political community in which they live (namely, the dimension of participation) and, lastly, it deals with a collective identity, a sense of belonging to a community (Bellamy 2008; Bellamy, Castiglione and Santoro 2004; Lister et al. 2007, 8-9). I believe that an important contribution to the development of these 'new theories' on citizenship came from the feminist thought (Plummer 2003, 60-61). In fact, since the end of the 1980s, a large body of studies have applied the theoretical and political tools of gender and feminist research to the analysis of citizenship.¹

In the following sections I present two critical perspectives which have arisen within the framework of feminist citizenship studies, discussing what, in my opinion, seem to be their main innovative points and contributions.

'Lived citizenship': a micro-sociological view of citizenship

The first perspective on which I focus pays attention to the subjective and micro-sociological dimensions of citizenship. It focuses on the ways in which social actors live, act and practice citizenship in their everyday lives. It is developed from a core of empirical works that analyse the experiences of citizenship of different categories of social actors in different contexts. In outlining the main features of this literature, it is worth mentioning that one privileged

field of research concerns representations of citizenship and forms of active citizenship among younger generations.² A growing interest is also becoming evident in relation to perceptions and practices of citizenship among migrants.³ Other studies are not limited to specific sectors of the population, but focus on representative samples.⁴ Finally, it is worth noting the collection of international studies by Naila Kabeer (2005), on the construction of citizenship 'from below' in various contexts in the global South and North.

Ruth Lister proposed the notion of 'lived citizenship' to refer to this new field of analysis (2005; Lister et al. 2003; Lister et al. 2007). Following this author, the concept 'is about how individuals understand and negotiate the three key elements of citizenship: rights and responsibilities, belonging and participation' (Lister et al. 2007, 168). In other words, the notion refers to 'the meanings that citizenship actually has in people's lives and the ways in which people's social and cultural backgrounds and material circumstances affect their lives as citizens' (Hall and Williamson 1999, 2; quot. in Lister et al. 2007, 167). Therefore, this perspective is interested in citizens' understandings of the meanings of citizenship, and in subjective representations of their position within the social and political community in which they live (e.g., do people perceive themselves as 'marginal citizens' or 'good citizens', 'active'

or 'passive citizens', to what extent do they wish to hold a more central position in society and politics, and so on).⁵ This line of research also focuses on the concrete practices through which people assert themselves as full citizens (e.g. by defending or expanding acquired rights, claiming new rights, attempting to access resources that make their rights substantive, participating in the social and political life where they live, and so on).

In my view, the perspective presented above has two particularly innovative aspects. First, it builds a bridge between two areas of study hitherto separate: the study of citizenship and the sociology of everyday life. The works mentioned above are an attempt to fill a clear empirical gap. In the contemporary citizenship debate, in comparison to the great proliferation of theories and normative models, the points of view of social actors are little investigated. Second, this perspective conceives of citizenship as a condition of inclusion and effective participation in a variety of spheres – the economic and labour sphere, the political sphere, the sphere of social relations, the family, the intimate sphere – paying attention to their daily facets. Following this view, individuals' experiences and representations of citizenship are shaped not only in relation to the administrative apparatus of the state or institutional politics, but also in relation to the labour market, civil society

organizations, welfare services, family relationships, and friendships and other intimate relationships. In other words, the lived citizenship perspective extends the analysis to aspects of everyday life that are usually excluded in the mainstream debate on citizenship, since they are considered to be outside the 'public' sphere and relating to the 'private' sphere. In my opinion, the genealogy with feminist thought is clear: as Lister also points out, 'understanding lived citizenship involves a challenge to the public-private dichotomy that underpinned the traditional association of citizenship with the public sphere' (Lister 2007, 55).

Dominant models of citizenship are based on a particular ideological construct: the division between 'public' and 'private' as two separate and opposite spheres of individual and collective life. The feminist critique, as it is known, has undermined this conceptual construction (Lister 1997; Sánchez Muñoz 2000; Saraceno 1988; 2008; Voet 1998; Vogel 1998; Walby 1994). First, the feminist critique demonstrates the interconnection between these two spheres, emphasizing that the resources produced and distributed in the 'private' or domestic domain affect access to and position in the 'public' sphere.⁶ Second, the feminist critique challenges the view of private, domestic and intimate spheres as non-political by definition. Equality is measured not only within politics, the labour market,

education, and in relation to welfare, but also within the family, in intimate partnerships, in social and affective relations.

Therefore, new issues acquire political relevance; relationships between genders, family relationships, forms of living together, and self-determination in sexual and reproductive life. It makes sense to think about sexual and reproductive rights and to study lived citizenship in relation to the family, sexual life and intimacy (Evans 1993; Richardson 1998; 2000; Weeks 1998). The field is thus opened to the investigation of what Ken Plummer theorizes as 'intimate citizenship' (Plummer 1995; 2003). By this term, the author means:

To suggest a cluster of emerging concerns over the rights to choose what we do with our bodies, our feelings, our identities, our relationships, our genders, our eroticisms and our representations. (Plummer 1995, 17)

Following Plummer's definition, intimacy refers to individuals' ethical stands and choices about the 'appropriate ways of living life with others' (Plummer 2003, 84). This wide-ranging 'arena of intimacies' encompasses the choices and self-determination of individuals in intimate, sexual, and family life, and the opportunity to decline relations within these fields according to their own cultural orientations and individual preferences (Plummer 2003,

13-15).

Intersectional theory and citizenship

The second innovative strand of research regards an emerging body of works that apply intersectional theory to the analysis of contemporary citizenship (Choo and Ferree 2010; Collins 1990; Crenshaw 1991; McCall 2005; Nash 2008; Walby 2007). This research shows how dimensions of gender, age, class, ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation and so on, shape both a person's legal status (e.g., formal citizenship, immigration status, and so on) and associated civic, social and political rights.⁷ The perspective developed in these contributions:

Recognises that the specific location of people in society – their group membership and categorical definition by gender, nationality, religion, ethnicity, 'race', ability, age or life cycle stage – mediates the construction of their citizenship as 'different' and thus determines their access to entitlements and their capacity to exercise independent agency. (Yuval-Davis and Werbner 1999, 5)

This perspective provides a fundamental contribution towards understanding the increasing complexity of contemporary citizenship structure, especially in destinations of international migration.

Indeed, one of the elements that has contributed to the growth of

this complexity is the political management of international migration flows (by states and international and supranational organizations), and the presence of large numbers of residents of migrant origin within a population. Different national laws not only continue to establish a fundamental legal distinction between aliens and nationals, but also introduce differences between migrant people by defining the legal forms of entry and leave to remain in a country, the requirements for the acquisition and maintenance of a regular status, the rules for family reunification, receiving welfare benefits, access to nationality, and so on. In this way, laws and politics on migration create different 'categories' of migrants, who are differentiated in terms of legal status. For instance, legal and illegal immigrants, temporary or permanent residents, European Union or Third-Country citizens, political refugees and asylum seekers, and so on.⁸ These statuses are associated with different sets of rights and duties, and also to different levels of security and the irreversibility of rights.

Lydia Morris (2002; 2003; 2009) proposes the concept of 'civic stratification' to describe this layered structure of differentiated rights and statuses; this continuum of hierarchical positions ranging from full citizenship (formal and substantive) to positions with no recognition nor enjoyment of basic rights.⁹ First developed by David Lockwood (1996),

the concept has been reformulated by Morris to denote:

A system of inequality based on the relationship between different categories of individuals and the state, and the rights thereby granted or denied. Central to such a system are the formal inclusions and exclusions which operate with respect to eligibility for rights and the informal gains and deficits that shape delivery. (Morris 2002, 144-145)

The concept forms a device that produces different 'gradations' of citizenship from two types of processes. On the one hand, the differential granting of rights by the state ('civic inclusion or exclusion'), and on the other, informal mechanisms of discrimination that hinder the enjoyment of rights ('civic gain or deficit') (Morris 2002, 7). These dynamics of discrimination are the result of interplay between different patterns of political regulation in the economic, social and cultural domains: namely, the welfare regime, the gender and care regime, the labour regime and the migration regime that characterize a particular context (Lister et al. 2007, 2-4).

In my opinion, Morris' model and, more generally, the development of an intersectional perspective introduces significant innovation to research that analyzes the links between international migration processes and changes in citizenship. This line of research, however

highly developed, suffers from two specific shortcomings that this perspective can overcome.¹⁰

The first shortcoming regards the gender blindness of research on migration and citizenship. While these studies often recognize the influence of national origins, ethnic and cultural differences or class position in migration policies, gender and sexual orientation are rarely taken into account. Moreover, these analyses tend to focus on just one or a few dimensions in isolation. In contrast, the specificity of the intersectional view lies in its call to develop an integrated analysis of all these axes of inequality, paying attention to how they intertwine and to mutual construction. In this sense, the intersectional perspective is useful to analyse how the classificatory system present in European and national immigration policies is imbued with gendered and sexualised, as well as ethnic, cultural, and class-based distinctions.

The second contribution of intersectional accounts of citizenship stems from the fact they encompass the dimension of substantial citizenship rather than simply focusing on the formal level. The mainstream tendency within research on citizenship and migration is to focus the analysis on aspects of legal status and entitlements to rights, as based on the legal structure. By contrast, the intersectional perspective on citizenship, in addition to these formal and legal aspects, considers actual

access to rights, analyzing the extent to which people are able to exercise their social, civil, and political rights. It also analyzes the different embodiments of rights, in correspondence to different locations on the continuum between citizens and non-citizens and different social positions, marked by gender, ethnicity, age, ability, and so on.

Intersectionality and the study of lived citizenship

In my view, the two key feminist perspectives discussed can complement each other and be integrated in a common research framework. Such a framework lies at the core of the research I present in the next part of the article.

This framework connects the macro and structural analysis of civic stratification with the micro-sociological analysis of the individuals' 'lived experiences of citizenship'. It pursues:

A more holistic study of citizenship, which combines analysis of citizenship regimes 'from above' with study of the cultural, social and political practices that constitute lived citizenship 'from below' (Lister et al. 2007, 168).

It is a powerful analytical tool, capable of grasping the increasingly stratified and unequal dynamic of contemporary citizenship.

Case study and methodology

In this second part of the paper,

I provide an example of an application of the research framework outlined above.

The example is drawn from ethnographic research on everyday and active citizenship among a group of migrant women, all involved in self-organized groups and voluntary associations based in Andalusia (in southern Spain). The research, carried out between 2007 and 2010, integrated two qualitative techniques: participant observation and discursive interviews. Forty migrant women from 27 associations were interviewed. The interviewees came from Third Countries¹¹ and new EU-27 Countries.¹² They hold different legal statuses¹³ and, at the time of the interview, had lived in Spain for between 2 and 25 years.¹⁴

The research explored the subjective and everyday experiences of these women, their paths towards inclusion in the receiving context, the consequences that the conference or limitation of rights had in their lives, their possibilities for action, their ability to pursue and realize their migration and life projects. It explored the self-representations of migrant women as 'citizens', 'non-citizens' or 'partial citizens' in reaction to these processes of inclusion or exclusion from the benefits and privileges linked to citizenship. The experiences of migrant women were analyzed in relation to various spheres of daily life, namely, the labour market and family work, the relationship with the administrative

system of the Spanish state, relationship with institutional politics, forms of participation in public spaces and civil society, family relations and the sphere of intimate life.

In the next section, I present some key findings related to the last field of analysis. The women's narratives are analysed with a focus on the organisation and reorganisation of their family lives and affective ties within the immigration context, as well as on their strategies for living these relationships in accordance with their wishes. The core analytical question deals with the consequences that inclusion and exclusion from rights has on the family and intimate lives of these women: in their personal experiences, self-representations and self-determination in the intimate sphere. A second objective of the analysis is to underline the similarities and differences among these experiences, connecting them the different positions the women occupy within the stratified structure of statuses and rights that characterises the Spanish context.

Migrant women's experiences of intimate citizenship

As already mentioned, the concept of intimate citizenship has been proposed to account for a transformation in the contents and meanings of citizenship in contemporary societies. It highlights how life choices and issues related to the intimate dimension of existence – questions commonly regarded as

private – are increasingly subject to public regulation: through state policies, but also through the production of discourses and public narratives on identities and other 'moral struggles' and their circulation in the spheres of the media, civil society, and politics (Plummer 2003, 95-116). The power of this public regulation, and especially state regulation, is stronger and more evident for migrants and migrant women. The stories collected show how migrant women are obliged to negotiate their projects and expectations related to family life and their relationships with partners and children within a field of possibilities whose borders are limited by law. This frame of 'institutional discrimination' (Cachón Rodríguez 1995; 2009), resulting from immigration laws and policies, constrains their ability to self-determination in relation to intimate aspects of their lives.

The Spanish rules governing family reunification place restrictions on the right to family unity, limiting enjoyment of this right to those who fulfil certain requirements.¹⁵ According to Spanish law, the non-EU citizen who wants to apply for family reunification must have resided legally in Spain for at least one year and be in possession of an independent residence permit of at least another year.¹⁶ He or she must also demonstrate to have sufficient financial resources and adequate housing. In addition, in cases of reunification of spouses, Spanish law gives the

reunited person a residence permit, but not a work permit.¹⁷ In this way, it tends to produce a state of economic and legal dependency among these people and implicitly assumes that most are women (Gil Araújo 2010; Mestre i Mestre 1999; 2005). These norms seem to shape roles and relationships within the family (in particular, relations between spouses) in line with the model of the single-income nuclear family, based on the rigid division between roles related to production (male) and reproduction (female). In my view, this tendency provides a glimpse of the extent to which Spanish immigration policies are rooted in and reflect the gendered divide between the public and private spheres. However, Spain is not an isolated case: different contributions have pointed out the gendered dimension of immigration management in EU countries (Lister et al. 2007; Kofman 2004; Kraler and Bonizzoni 2010). In this view, migrant men and women are cast in different roles and charged with different tasks and responsibilities, linked to productive and reproductive work. They are thus placed in different locations within the stratified system of statuses, rights and duties which constitute the space of citizenship.

In this frame, migrant women's choices concerning intimate life (for instance, the choice to divorce a spouse who facilitated their entry into Spain) appear to be bound to advantages and disadvantages per-

taining to residence documents, as well as chances of economic independence outside the family. For example, Juana recounts how concern over losing her regular status made it more difficult for her to decide to leave her husband:¹⁸

Yes, things weren't going that well but... I put up with it a bit, I tried... well, at the beginning, you know... Apart from... what would I have done alone? Why create problems for myself [I told myself] that I didn't even have a job. And then that I wasn't so smart! [...] I was afraid of losing my permit.

[Int. 21, 45 year old from Equatorial Guinea, lives alone, has three children]

While concerns over economic independence can be seen as a widespread experience linked to the women's structural disadvantage in the Spanish labour market, the concern for 'documents' is something that marks a distance between the experiences of migrant women (especially from Third Countries) and native women.¹⁹

Aside from cases of family reunification, more general rules governing the entry and residence of non-EU people also seek to steer family and intimate choices when taking into account administrative constraints. In a context of restrictive rules, marriage with a Spanish or EU citizen is one of the easiest ways to access residence and, later, nationality. The choice to marry may thus be

made not only to follow a personal project or desire (for instance, giving the relationship a socially recognized form, promising eternal love or whatever else leads people to marry), but to acquire a more secure and beneficial legal status. For instance, Bibiana is a woman from a Latin American country who moved to Spain some years ago to move in with her partner (the man who was her husband at the time of the interview). In her narrative of her early time in Spain, the way in which she accounts for the decision to get married, despite wishing simply to live together, stands out:

In April, I met this man. [...] And we carried on, as boyfriend and girlfriend, for a year and a half. [...] And then we decided that ... either we end it or I would come here [to Spain]. [...] So we decided that I would come, that we would live together, so we could see how things went. And... we got married. Obviously, because otherwise how could I manage with the documents? [...] My idea, of course, was not to sit around with my arms folded, it was to find a job and do something. But since I was not really young, it was '96 I was ... if I'm 43 now ... well, in short, there was no other way. [Int. 16, 43 year old, from Colombia, lives with partner and one child]

These excerpts from the interviews suggest that Spanish migra-

tion politics can drive non-EU migrant women to build and maintain family forms and arrangements that approximate the model of a nuclear family, that is based on marriage (in the 'traditional' form, i.e. heterosexual marriage) and on the gendered division of productive and reproductive work between the partners. A condition of dependency is created - a dependency that, as we have seen, is not just economic, but also legal. This element marks a strong inequality between migrants (at least until naturalization) and native people. Yet, it also introduces differences and inequalities among migrants themselves, since the power of these constraints and the extent of the limitation of rights differs according to the socio-economic and migratory profile of the woman. In particular, it depends on her national origin and the economic and professional position she occupies in Spain. First, most restrictions of rights concern non-EU migrants, distinguishing their condition from that of EU migrants. Then, among Third Countries, women from former colonies (Equatorial Guinea, the Philippines and Latin American countries) can to some extent escape the condition of forced dependency and avoid the 'problem' of documents with regard to their intimate and family choices. Spanish law facilitates the acquisition of Spanish nationality for these women, who can apply for naturalization after two years of legal residence in

the country.²⁰ This means that, at a relatively 'early' stage of their life in Spain, they have a possible way out of rights limitation. This is a concrete consequence of a 'preference for origin' clause in the Spanish legislation (Agrela Romero and Gil Araújo 2005).²¹ However, this strategy for escaping family dependency and rights restrictions is only available for women who enter the country legally and have resided in Spain for the whole required period (two years). A norm that entails an 'ethnic preference' is thus revealed to exclude some categories of people as a result of their immigration status and, although not directly, their economic and professional position. Indeed, the analysis of women's narratives also revealed elements of heterogeneity in the women's experiences linked to their different social and immigration profiles. The constraints and opportunities that migrant women meet with in their efforts to build relationships and families according to their wishes are of varied types and strengths.

The narratives of women in relation to intimate citizenship seem to be organized around two main issues. In a first group of stories, the experience of migration is seen as providing opportunities for self-development and realization in intimate and family life. In another set of interviews, the central feature is the experience of living far from children and partner. The narratives in the first group reveal women who,

in the context of immigration, have been able to build a kind of family, to live a life with their partners, removed from the dominant models of their original countries. Women who have decided to postpone children, who have built a family with a same-sex partner, or who have been able to establish a relationship based on equality with a partner who shares the same gender values and 'makes her happier' [int 10]. For instance Latifa has chosen to wait and have children only after her postgraduate studies. In this case, being far away from her family reduces the social pressure for her (and her husband) to have children sooner, and helps them maintain a choice that is an unconventional one in terms of her social background:

And I'm sorry, when I meet them [her former classmates, also Moroccan], to see that they haven't finished their studies and have a life ... that is not what they wanted. Okay, for them it's different, they live a different life, because they got married, have children... well, I'm married too! [laughs] but for now ... I prefer to wait [to have children]. And sometimes, yes, on holiday, when you go on holiday [to Morocco] and there's the aunt who says: 'When do you think you'll have children?' But for now, okay, we're fine, here we're fine. [Int. 18, 35 year old, from Morocco, lives with her partner, no children]

The women who express these kinds of narratives are mostly young, or came to Spain at a young age with the intention of living their lives in a foreign country, in an unfamiliar context. For many of these women, leaving their country of origin coincided with their exit from the family of origin: their migration was linked to the transition from youth to adulthood. For others, the migration project seems to be related to other points of transition: for instance, the end of a relationship or marriage, the search for 'independence', the desire to 'start a new life'. As far as their immigrant status is concerned, it is worth pointing out that most are regular residents (with a residence permit for family, work or study reasons).

In the second group of narratives, distance from the family has a negative connotation, since more space is dedicated to the experience of distance or transnational motherhood and the difficulties in obtaining reunification with children. In these stories, a sense of injustice emerges in relation to what is perceived as the 'removal' of an important part of their lives: the deprivation of affection, the impossibility to share daily life with their family, not seeing their children grow. For instance, talking about her first years in Spain, when she was an irregular live-in domestic worker, Mara said:

And then I'll tell you something, thinking of my daughter... whom I left in my country for three and

a half years, with my husband... and I woke up, looked at the clock hoping that the hours and days would pass: another day has passed, and another... And so I waited to be able to see my family ... [...] I missed my family very much, my daughter, my husband, my family [...] Do you understand? It was like that for three years, and I realized that nothing in this world, nothing at all, money... nothing is worth that. The years of my daughter's life that I lost... I can never get them back. [Int. 11, 35 year old, from Romania, lives with partner and one child]

These experiences show to what extent immigration laws can undermine self-determination in the intimate fields of life. Strong constraints are imposed on these women, as they are unable to maintain the closeness of their affective ties, to restore the family unit in the context of immigration, to positively combine economic needs and affective needs, their need to find a job abroad and their wish to live a full family life. These difficulties are exacerbated for women with irregular status, irregular workers, or women who are employed in domestic service cohabiting with their employers, since they cannot usually meet the legal requirements for child (or partner) reunification (conditions related to income and housing, and regarding the possession of a regular and

independent residence permit). The greater restrictions on family rights that these categories of migrant women experience are the consequences of discrimination on the basis of class and economic position encapsulated in Spanish migration laws and politics. Indeed, Spanish laws (in this example, the rules for family unification) create different categories of migrants on the basis of class, economic and professional condition and buying power, and select those who are entitled to enjoy the civil right to a family (those who have regular employment, an income sufficient for the maintenance of dependents and so on) and those who are not (Gil Araújo 2010).

On one hand, the selection of incoming migrants (e.g. the reunited family members of existing resident migrants) on the basis of their economic status aims to guarantee that the family unit will not 'weigh' on the Spanish welfare system. In this sense, these processes of selection draw on a protectionist and 'chauvinistic' discourse on welfare (Habermas 1998:636). On the other hand, this form of rights restriction also reveals a utilitarian logic, since it seems to respond to the structural demand for a flexible labour force for the care and domestic work sector, typical of the Spanish welfare system. This 'mediterranean' and 'familistic' welfare system is marked by an imbalance in the distribution of care responsibilities between the State, the family and the market.

Within these fields, care tasks are also unequally distributed between genders, generations, different socio-economic layers and, more recently, different ethnic/national origins (native and migrant people, migrants from different countries). In this frame, these migrant women represent a valuable 'resource' for the Spanish labour market and, more specifically, for the niche of care and domestic work: a sector that demands workers with particular availability, among other qualities. The live-in domestic worker symbolises the 'ideal' profile required by this sector: a person (usually a woman) who is temporarily forced to free herself from daily care tasks for her own family, and who does not need any work-family balance.

Therefore, although I have shown that restrictive Spanish migration laws often drive migrant women to reproduce family and couple relationships in ways that seem to adhere to 'traditional' models (as long as they are based on marriage, and on the gendered division of productive and reproductive work), I also wish to point out that this is no longer the case for women who produce this second group of narratives. When the family as a space of affection, love and care conflicts with the logics and requirements of Spanish welfare, labour and care regimes, migrant women can be forced to live a disjunction between physical proximity, love and care.

They must rearticulate care outside the context of shared daily life, and rely on alternative care providers for their children (e.g.: a relative or a childcare institution). These are arrangements that are far from normal in the 'traditional' model of the nuclear family.

In this frame, the infringement of the right to family unity expressed by this second group of women becomes the measure of their partial citizenship status in Spanish society. At the same time, the experience of 'transnational motherhood' testifies both to their ability to strategically rearticulate care and family life in a context of restrictive rules, and to the disadvantaged position they occupy in 'survival circuits' (Sassen 2003a; 2003b) and global care chains (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003; Parreñas 2001).

Conclusion

In this analysis of the experiences of intimate citizenship, we have seen that immigration policies strongly constrain migrant women's self-determination in family and intimate life, and limit some civil freedoms and intimate rights (e.g., family rights). This marks a strong element of inequality between migrants and native people, since the power of public regulation is greater for the formers than for the latter, even in the intimate field. However, it also introduces inequalities between migrant women, and leads to different experiences. In this vein,

we have seen that the women's accounts and narratives vary greatly depending on social and immigration profile, and their position in the structure we have called 'civic stratification'. As explained, this term refers to the stratified structure of legal status, rights and opportunities, in which the material and symbolic resources necessary for full citizenship are unevenly distributed (Melucci 2000).

For some women, the immigration context seems to open up new opportunities and freedoms: the focal points of their narratives are the empowering outcomes of migration and their increased capacity for self-determination in the new context. In other words, we can say that these women experience the inclusive side of citizenship. Other women, however, experience the power of exclusion of contemporary citizenship, prevented from enjoying the right to family life and forced to choose between their economic needs and their affective needs. We can say that state laws strongly limit their possibilities to choose and live 'the life they want' [int. 5].

The analysis presented in the second part of the paper shows how the theoretical framework elaborated in my research allows the implications of inclusion or exclusion from full citizenship rights for different subjects to be grasped, particularly by linking their structural position (the macro level of analysis) to their everyday practices and lived experi-

ences (the micro level). Moreover, the theoretical and empirical analysis discussed in this paper is based on a definition of citizenship seen not only as a matter of legal status and formal rights, but also as a condition related to people's everyday experiences in multiple domains: social, political, work, family and the intimate sphere. From this point of view, empirical studies of citizenship should pay attention to substantive rights within each of these areas, as well as to the dimension of self-determination. A feminist-oriented analysis of citizenship should consider how far people have 'the ability to exercise control over their own lives' and bodies, what level of access they have to the material and symbolic resources necessary for their well-being, and how far they are able to choose between different life options (Kabeer 2005:11).

In addition, the perspective proposed in this work conceives of citizenship as a construction in which different subjects cooperate: people who enjoy the legal and symbolic recognition of their belonging to the community and have full citizenship rights (formal 'citizens'), but also those who aspire to such recognition and who are partially or entirely excluded from citizenship benefits ('marginal citizens', non-citizens, and so on). Placing the analysis within this framework, it is possible to address citizenship in relation to subjectivities and dimensions of individual and collective life conven-

tionally excluded from mainstream definitions of the concept.

Therefore, in the research presented in this paper, it was possible to investigate citizenship in relation to migrant women's personal and intimate experiences. It was possible to question the conditions and perceptions of citizenship among subjects who, in most of cases, were not – or not yet – formal citizens, and who were located at the margins or in 'borderline' positions (insiders/outside) within the gendered, ethnicised and classed structure of citizenship of Spain.

Endnotes

¹ For an overview, see: Bonacchi and Groppi (1993); Lister (1997); Lister et al. (2007); Voet (1998); Vogel (1998); Walby (1994); Zincone (1992).

² See: with reference to the British context: France, Meredith and Sandu (2007); Hall and Coffey (2007); Hall, Coffey and Williamson (1998); Lister (2005); Lister et al. (2003); Smith et al. (2005). For the Spanish context: Morán Calvo Sotelo and Benedicto (2003). For Italy: Colombo (2009); Colombo, Domaneschi and Marchetti (2009).

³ With special regard to migrant women, see the comparative analysis by Erel (2009) on migrant women in Great Britain and Germany, by Lister et al. (2007, 137-165) on migrant care and domestic workers in Sweden, Great Britain and Spain; the study of migrant domestic workers in Canada by Stasiulis and Bakan (2005).

⁴ For the British context see Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley (2004); Dwyer (2000; 2002); see also the comparative study on Great Britain and the United States by Conover, Crewe and Searing (1991).

⁵ And also 'non-citizens' understandings, as I will explain in the next paragraph.

⁶ Essential resources for the presence and participation of women and men in politics, civil society, the labour market, and education are, for instance: time (Leccardi 2009), and psychological and physical wellbeing. Both entail a particular need for self-determination in reproductive choices.

⁷ For an overview, see: Abraham et al. (2010); Kambouri and Zavos (2010); Kofman (1995; 2002); Kraler (2010); Lister et al. (2007); Lutz (1997); Lutz, Phoenix and Yuval-Davis (1995); Morris (2002); Rottmann and Ferree (2008); Yuval-Davis and Werbner (1999).

⁸ The term 'denizen' has been proposed to indicate the legal figure of the permanent resident who enjoys extensive civil, social and economic rights, but who is denied full political rights (Brubaker 1989; Hammar 1990; Heisler and Heisler 1986; Layton-Henry 1990).

⁹ Marco Martiniello (1994, 42-44) proposes the term 'margizens'; Alessandro Dal Lago (1999) speaks of 'non-persons'.

¹⁰ For an overview, see: Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer (2000a; 2000b); Bauböck (1994; 2006); Castles and Davidson (2000); Giraudon and Lahav (2000); Joppke (1998; 1999); Koopmans et al. (2005); Martiniello (1995); Soysal (1994).

¹¹ More specifically, 15 interviewees came from Latin American countries (Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia, Paraguay, the Dominican Republic and Brazil), 13 women came from Morocco, 3 from Equatorial Guinea and 1 from Nigeria, and 1 woman came from Eastern Europe (Ukraine).

¹² Countries that became members of the European Union in 2007, including Romania, from where 7 of the interviewees came.

¹³ At the time of the interview, most of the women held different kinds of residence permits (first residence and work permit, which lasts 2 years; renewed residence and work permit – another 2 years; residence permit without authorization to work; permanent residence permit; EU citizen's permit; permission to stay as a student); some had Spanish nationality or double nationality; a few were illegal immigrants without documents.

¹⁴ In more detail: at the time of the interview, 6 women had lived in Spain for two years or less; 9 for between three and five years; 15 between six and nine years; 8 from ten to twenty years and 2 women for more than twenty years.

¹⁵ Ley Orgánica 4/2000 (sections from 16 to 18) and Real Decreto 2393/2004 (sections from 38 to 44).

¹⁶ An authorization that does not depend on the residence permit of a relative.

¹⁷ The work permit can be requested later in the presence of a job offer. This arrangement pushes to enter into the irregular or informal occupational market, or to stay out of the labour market.

¹⁸ All names are fictional.

¹⁹ However, some differences can still be seen between non-EU migrant women and others. The first are subject to many legal restrictions in terms of their entry and mobility in the labour market. They also occupy a more disadvantaged position in the Spanish labour market than native women (Cachón Rodríguez 2007; Perjures, Paella, and Cavalcanti 2008; Solé and Parella Rubio 2003).

²⁰ The requirement for other non-EU citizens is ten years; four years for EU citizens, five for refugees and asylum seekers.

²¹ This is an example of the creation of migrant categories on the basis of cultural similarity or distance. Many states facilitate entry and settlement for people considered similar to their own population from a linguistic and religious point of view, or in terms of ethnic and 'racial' criteria. Many states also seek to facilitate the acquisition or recovery of formal citizenship for those who can demonstrate descent from one of their nationals (Joppke 2005; Thränhardt 2000).

References

Abraham, M., E. Chow, E. Tastsoglou, and L. Maratou-Alipranti, eds. 2010. *Contours of citizenship: Women, diversity and practices of citizenship*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Agrela Romero, B., and S. Gil Araújo. 2005. Constructing otherness: The managing of immigration and diversity in the Spanish context. *Migrations: European Journal of*

Ethnic Relations 43-44 (1): 9–33.

Aleinikoff, A., and D. Klusmeyer. 2000a. *Citizenship policies for an age of migration: The comparative citizenship project*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment.

Aleinikoff, A., and D. Klusmeyer. 2000b. *From migrants to citizens: Membership in a changing world*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment.

Bauböck, R. 1994. *Transnational citizenship: Membership and rights in international migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bauböck, R. 2006. *Migration and citizenship: Legal status, rights and political participation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

Bellamy, R. 2008. *Citizenship: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bellamy, R., D. Castiglione, and E. Santoro, eds. 2004. *Lineages of European citizenship. Rights, belonging and participation in eleven nation-states*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benedicto, J., and M. L. Morán Calvo Sotelo. 2003. *Aprendiendo a ser ciudadanos: Experiencias sociales y construcción de la ciudadanía entre los jóvenes*. Madrid: Instituto de la Juventud.

Bonacchi, G., and A. Groppi, eds. 1993. *Il dilemma della cittadinanza*:

- Diritti e doveri delle donne*. Bari: Laterza.
- Brubaker, R., eds. 1989. *Immigration and the politics of citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Cachón Rodríguez, L. 1995. Marco institucional de la discriminación y tipos de inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo en España. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 69:105–124.
- Cachón Rodríguez, L. 2009. *La España inmigrante: Marco discriminatorio, mercado de trabajo y políticas de integración*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Castles, S., and A. Davidson. 2000. *Citizenship and migration. Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Palgrave.
- Choo, H. Y., and M. M. Ferree. 2010. Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28 (2): 129–149.
- Collins, P. H. 1990. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Colombo, E. 2009. Oltre la cittadinanza multiculturale. Le rappresentazioni dei diritti, dei doveri e delle appartenenze tra alcuni giovani delle scuole superiori. *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia* 50 (3): 433–462.
- Colombo, E., L. Domaneschi, and C. Marchetti. 2009. *Una nuova generazione di italiani. L'idea di cittadinanza tra i giovani figli di immigrati*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Conover, P., I. Crewe, and D. Searing. 1991. The nature of citizenship in the United States and Great Britain: Empirical comments on theoretical themes. *The Journal of Politics* 53 (3): 800–832.
- Costa, P. 1999. Dalla civiltà comunale al Settecento. Vol. 1 of *Civitas: Storia della cittadinanza in Europa*. Rome: Laterza.
- Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of colour. *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–1299.
- Dal Lago, A. 1999. *Non-persone. L'esclusione dei migranti in una società globale*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Dwyer, P. 2000. *Welfare rights and responsibilities: Contesting social citizenship*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dwyer, P. 2002. Making sense of social citizenship: Some user views on welfare rights and responsibilities. *Critical Social Policy* 22 (2): 273–299.
- Ehrenreich, B., and A. Russell Hochschild. 2003. *Global woman: Nannies, maids, and sex workers in the new economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

- Erel, U. 2009. *Migrant women transforming citizenship: Life stories from Britain and Germany*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Evans, D. 1993. *Sexual citizenship: The material construction of sexualities*. London: Routledge.
- France, A., J. Meredith, and A. Sandu. 2007. Youth culture and citizenship in multicultural Britain. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 15 (3): 303–316.
- Gil Araújo, S. 2010. *Family Migration Policies in Spain. NODE Policy Report*. Vienna: BMWF / ICMPD. <http://research.icmpd.org> (accessed June 15, 2011)
- Guiraudon, V., and G. Lahav. 2000. A reappraisal of the state sovereignty debate: The case of migration control. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (2): 163–195.
- Habermas, J. 1998. *Facticidad y validez. Sobre el derecho y el Estado democrático de derecho en términos de teoría del discurso*. Madrid: Trotta. Originally published as 1992. *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur diskurstheorie des rechts und des demokratischen rechtsstaats*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hall, T., A. Coffey, and H. Williamson. 1998. Conceptualizing citizenship: Young people and the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Education Policy* 13 (3): 301–315.
- Hall, T., and A. Coffey. 2007. Learning selves and citizenship: Gender and youth transitions. *Journal of Social Policy* 36 (2): 279–296.
- Hall, T., and H. Williamson. 1999. *Citizenship and community*. Leicester: Youth Work Press.
- Hammar, T. 1990. *Democracy and the nation state: Aliens, denizens, and citizens in a world of international migration*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Heisler, M., and B. Shmitter Heisler. 1986. *From foreign workers to settlers? Transnational migration and the emergence of new minorities*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Isin, E., and B. Turner. 2007. Investigating citizenship: An agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 5–17.
- Joppke, C. 1998. *Challenge to the nation state. Immigration in West Europe and USA*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Joppke, C. 1999. How immigration is changing citizenship: A comparative view. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22 (4): 629–652.
- Joppke, C. 2005. *Selecting by origin: Ethnic migration in the liberal state*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kabeer, N., eds. 2005. *Inclusive citizenship: Meanings and expressions*. London: Zed Books.

- Kambouri, N., and A. Zavos. 2010. On the frontiers of citizenship: Considering the case of Konstantina Kuneva and the intersections between gender, migration and labour in Greece. *Feminist Review* 94 (1): 148–155.
- Kofman, E. 1995. Citizenship for some but not for others: Spaces of citizenship in contemporary Europe. *Political Geography* 14 (2): 121–137.
- Kofman, E. 2002. Contemporary European migrations, civic stratification and citizenship. *Political Geography* 21 (8): 1035–1054.
- Kofman, E. 2004. Family-related migration: A critical review of European Studies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (2): 243–262.
- Koopmans, R., P. Statham, M. Giugni, and F. Passy. 2005. *Contested citizenship. Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kraler, A. 2010. Civic stratification, gender and family migration policies in Europe. Final Report. Vienna: BMWF / ICMPD. <http://research.icmpd.org> (accessed June 15, 2011)
- Kraler, A, and P. Bonizzoni. 2010. Gender, civic stratification and the right to family life: Problematising immigrants' integration in the EU. International. *Review of Sociology* 20 (1): 199–205.
- Kymlicka, W., and W. Norman. 1994. Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics* 104 (2): 352–381.
- Layton-Henry, Z. 1990. *The political rights of migrant workers in Western Europe*. London: Sage.
- Leccardi, C. 2009. Sociologia del tempo. Soggetti e tempo nella società dell'accelerazione. Rome: Laterza.
- Lister, R. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. London: MacMillan.
- Lister, R. 2005. Young people talking about citizenship in Britain. In *Inclusive citizenship: Meanings and expressions*, ed. N. Kabeer, 114–134. London: Zed Books.
- Lister, R. 2007. Inclusive citizenship: Realizing the potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61.
- Lister, R., N. Smith, S. Middleton, and L. Cox. 2003. Young people talking about citizenship: Empirical perspectives on theoretical debates. *Citizenship Studies* 7 (2): 235–253.
- Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, J. Heinen, A. Gavanias, S. Johansson, A. Leira, U. Gerhard, and C. Tobio. 2007. *Gendering citizenship in Western Europe. New challenges for citizenship research in a cross-national context*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lockwood, D. 1996. Civic integration and class formation. *British Journal of Sociology* 47 (3): 531–550.

- Lutz, H. 1997. The limits of european-ness: Immigrant women in Fortress Europe. *Feminist Review* 57 (3): 93–111.
- Lutz, H., A. Phoenix, and N. Yuval-Davis. 1995. *Crossfires: Nationalism, racism and gender in Europe*. London: Pluto Press.
- Martiniello, M. 1994. Citizenship and the European Union: a critical view. In *From aliens to citizens. Redefining the legal status of immigrants in Europe*, ed. R. Bauböck, 29–48. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Martiniello, M. 1995. *Migration, citizenship and ethno-national identities in the European Union*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- McCall, L. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (3): 1771–1800.
- Melucci, A. 2000. *Diventare persone. Conflitti e nuova cittadinanza nella società planetaria*. Turin: Edizioni Gruppo Abele.
- Mestre i Mestre, R. 1999. Vínculo social y trabajo hoy (o porqué las inmigrantes no trabajan). *Cuadernos Electrónicos de Filosofía del Derecho* 2:17–36.
- Mestre i Mestre, R. 2005. Trabajadoras de cuidado. Las mujeres en la Ley de Extranjería. In *Mujeres en el camino*, ed. F. Checa, 64–78. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Morris, L. 2002. *Managing migration. Civic stratification and migrants' rights*. London: Routledge.
- Morris, L. 2003. Managing contradictions: Civic stratification and migrants' rights. *International Migration Review* 37 (1): 74–100.
- Morris, L. 2009. Civic stratification and the cosmopolitan ideal. *European Societies* 11 (4): 603–624.
- Nash, J. C. 2008. Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review* 89 (1): 1–15.
- Pajares, M., S. Parella Rubio and L. Cavalcanti. 2008. *Inmigración y mercado de trabajo: Informe 2008*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.
- Parreñas Salazar, R. 2001. *Servants of globalization: Women, migration and domestic work*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Pattie, C., P. Seyd, and P. Whiteley. 2004. *Citizenship in Britain: Values, participation and democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plummer, K. 1995. *Telling sexual stories: Power, change, and social worlds*. London: Routledge.
- Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate citizenship. Private decisions and public dialogues*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Richardson, D. 1998. Sexuality and citizenship. *Sociology* 32 (1): 83–

- 100.
- Richardson, D. 2000. Constructing sexual citizenship: Theorizing sexual rights. *Critical Social Policy* 20 (1): 105–135.
- Rottmann, S. B., and M. M. Ferree. 2008. Citizenship and intersectionality: German feminist debates about headscarf and antidiscrimination laws. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 15 (4): 481–513.
- Sánchez Muñoz, C. 2000. La difícil alianza entre ciudadanía y género. In *También somos ciudadanas*, ed. P. Pérez Cantó, 3–25. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios de la Mujer / Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Saraceno, C. 1988. La struttura di genere della cittadinanza. *Democrazia e Diritto* 28(1): 273–295.
- Saraceno, C. 2008. Tra uguaglianza e differenza: Il dilemma irrisolto della cittadinanza femminile. *Il Mulino* 4: 603–614.
- Sassen, S. 2003a. The feminisation of survival: Alternative global circuits. In *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries. Gender on the move*, eds. U. Erel, K. Shinozaki and M. Morokvasic-Muller, 59–76. Opladen: Leske Budrich.
- Sassen, S. 2003b. Global cities and survival circuits. In *Global woman: Nannies, maids, and sex workers in the new economy*, eds. B. Ehrenreich and A. Russell Hochschild, 233–244. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Smith, N., R. Lister, S. Middleton, and L. Cox. 2005. Young people as real citizens: Towards an inclusionary understanding of citizenship. *Journal of Youth Studies* 8 (4): 425–443.
- Solé, C., and S. Parella Rubio. 2003. The labour market and racial discrimination in Spain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(1): 121–140.
- Soysal, Y. N. 1994. Limits of citizenship. *Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Stasiulis, D., and A. Bakan. 2005. *Negotiating citizenship: Migrant women in Canada and the global system*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Thränhardt, D. 2000. Tainted blood: The ambivalence of ethnic migration in Israel, Japan, Korea, Germany and the United States. *German Policy Studies/Politikfeldanalyse* 1 (3): 273–301.
- Voet, R. 1998. *Feminism and citizenship*. London: Sage.
- Vogel, U. 1998. Is citizenship gender-specific? In *Frontiers of citizenship*, eds. U. Vogel and M. Moran, 58–85. London: MacMillan.
- Walby, S. 1994. Is citizenship gendered? *Sociology* 28 (2): 379–395.

- Walby, S. 2007. Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 37(4): 449–470.
- Weeks, J. 1998. The sexual citizen. *Theory, Culture & Society* 15 (3): 35–52.
- Yuval-Davis, N., and P. Werbner, eds. 1999. *Women, citizenship and difference*. London: Zed Books.
- Zincone, G. 1992. Da sudditi a cittadini. *Le vie dello stato e le vie della società civile*. Bologna: Il Mulino.